

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

GINTTED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Bee 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/761,317	01/17/2001	Yoshiyuki Tonami	36856.406	4649
7590 {1/12/2003			EXAMINER	
Keating & Bennett LLP			KACKAR, RAM N	
10400 Eaton Pla Fairfax, VA 2			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1763	
			DATE MAILED: 11/12/2003	3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
A ab sia a so . A a 4ia sa	09/761,317	TONAMI ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ram N Kackar	1763
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	l ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 14 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: ('condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	THIS APPLICATION IN COND void abandonment of this applic 1) a timely filed amendment whi	ITION FOR ALLOWANCE. cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	<u>:PLY</u> [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most partned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
NOTE: Please see attached.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20,25 and 26</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	proved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	
10.☐ Other:	· / · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	SUPE TE	GRZEOW MILLS RVISORY PATENT EXAMINER CHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

Application/Control Number: 09/761,317

Art Unit: 1763

Appendix

Response to Amendment

Regarding rejection based on Hayashi, the passage "However tungsten layer is known to prevent diffusion of gold (Abstract and Col 5 lines 5-11 and Fig 6b)" refers to Hayashi.

Regarding the teaching of removing the feeder layer- the conductive layer used for connecting electricity for electroplating- examiner has relied upon the teaching disclosed in Col 2 line 28-31. This should be read in context with the drawing (1a- 1o). In this case numeral 4 is used to disclose feeder layer, which is used for connecting electricity for electroplating and is later removed by using techniques applicable to removing metallic layers. This example clearly discloses that after the basic purpose of the feeder film is accomplished the layer may be removed. There would be no purpose in keeping unwanted conducting layer, when real estate on the substrate would be needed for active components later on.

Regarding JP 06-260482 to Takashi, this reference also teaches feeder layer that is removed after its purpose is done. Drawings 19-26 of Takashi as mentioned in the office action are explained in paragraph 0034 of the English translation submitted. The feeder layer is disclosed to be done as layer 2 over which layer 4 is formed (drawings 1-3). As explained with regards to drawing 20 the feeder layer is partially etched to make opening for the base film. In drawing 25 layer 4 is removed. As both layers 2 and 4 act to facilitate conduction of electricity for electroplating the combination would be called a feeder film. Base film 5c clearly overlaps this feeder film.